UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,392	04/02/2004	Wayne D. Young	019680-009100US	2905

20350 7590 04/18/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
TRAN, TRANG U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/817,392	YOUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trang U. Tran	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed Jan. 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 7-8, applicants argue that the motivation to place the upsampling circuit 70 of Rinaldi is incorrect and does not apply because both the admitted prior art and Rinaldi already produce different video outputs with data from a pixel buffer.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the admitted prior teaches outputting video signal to SDTV display and computer monitor. Rinaldi teaches outputting video signal to composite video output port and S-video output port (col. 1, lines 24-30). From the teaching of Rinaldi, one of ordinary skill in the art would motivate to incorporate the upsampling circuit 70 of Rinaldi into the output stream of the present specification to produce a plurality of different video outputs (at least the composite video output and S-video output) as taught by Rinaldi. Thus, the motivation of the combination is correct and is taught by Rinaldi.

In re pages 8-9, applicants argue that the Office Action does not address the limitation “the supersampling rate being higher than the base sampling rate” and the upsampling circuit 70 generates an output with a rate that equals the base sampling rate corresponding to the target analog signal.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed previously, Rinaldi et al discloses in col. 3, lines 57-59 that "The output control module 21 includes a YCrCb to YUV converter 66, the input switching matrix 68, up sample module 70, and

“n output switching matrix 72”. It is noted that the up sample module 70 of Rinaldi et al would upsamples the digital signal with higher sampling rate. Thus, the claimed "a supersampling circuit" is anticipated by the up-sampling module 70 of Rinaldi et al.

In re pages 9-10, applicants argue that claim 2 is allowable for the reason that the frequency of upsampling module 70 is chosen to match that of the output analog signal, and not to be higher than that of the output analog signal and not to suppress higher frequency echoes, nowhere does Rinaldi mention the suppression of echoes and since the frequencies used match the output signal, no suppression of echoes actually occurs in Rinaldi, and Rinaldi does not even use the term “echo”.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the last Office Action, the combination of the admitted prior art and Rinaldi et al discloses all the structural limitations of claim 2. Since, the combination of the admitted prior art and Rinaldi et al discloses all the structural limitations of claim 2, the **desired result "suppression of echoes"** would inherently presented in the proposed combination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) in view of Rinaldi et al (US Patent No. 6,327,002 B1).

In considering claim 1, the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a pixel pipeline circuit configured to provide a pixel stream comprising digital pixel values, wherein the pixel pipeline circuit has an input connected with a digital pixel buffer is met by the pixel pipeline 132 (Fig. 1B), 2) the claimed an encoder coupled to an output of the pixel pipeline circuit and having one or more processor elements configured to convert the pixel stream to digital sample values for a target analog signal representing the pixel stream in the target format, thereby generating a base data stream at a base sampling rate is met by the encoder 134 (Fig. 1B), 3), and 3) the claimed a digital to analog converter coupled to an output of the supersampling circuit and configured to convert the supersampled data stream to an analog output signal having the target format is met by the DAC 136 (Fig. 1B).

However, the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) explicitly does not disclose the claimed a supersampling circuit coupled to an output of the encoder and configured to generate a supersampled data stream at a supersampling rate from the base data stream, the supersampling rate being higher than the base sampling rate.

Rinaldi et al teach that the up sampling module 70 which changes the sampling frequency of the signals to match the desired output sampling frequencies (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the up sampling as taught by Rinaldi et al into the

admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006])'s system in order to process the video signals to produce a plurality of different video outputs.

In considering claim 2, the claimed wherein the supersampling rate is selected so as to provide substantial attenuation of a higher frequency echo in the analog output signal, the higher frequency echo occurring in a frequency band above a baseband of the analog output signal is met by the up sampling module 70 which changes the sampling frequency of the signals to match the desired output sampling frequencies (the rate is selected from the input switching matrix 68) (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 7 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 3, the claimed further comprising an electromagnetic interference (EMI) filter coupled to an output of the digital to analog converter and configured to substantially attenuate frequency components of the analog output signal above a maximum frequency is met by the electromagnetic interference (EMI) filter 128, which is simply a low pass filter with a frequency cut off above about 200 MHz of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]).

In considering claim 4, the claimed wherein the supersampling rate is selected so as to substantially attenuate an echo of the analog output signal, the echo appearing in a frequency band between a baseband of the analog signal and the maximum frequency is met by the up sampling module 70 which changes the sampling frequency of the signals to match the desired output sampling frequencies (the rate is selected from the input switching matrix 68) (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 7 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 5, the claimed wherein the baseband of the analog output signal is determined with reference to a baseband for a standard definition television monitor is met by the processing the incoming video signal through plurality of output video sources (Fig. 4, col. 4, line 44 to col. 6, line 20 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 6, the claimed wherein the baseband of the analog output signal is determined with reference to a baseband for a high definition television monitor is met by the processing the incoming video signal through plurality of output video sources (Fig. 4, col. 4, line 44 to col. 6, line 20 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 7, the claimed wherein the encoder is further configured to respond to one or more control parameters, thereby enabling selection of one of a plurality of candidate formats as the target format is met by the input switching matrix 68 (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 7 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 8, the claimed wherein the plurality of candidate formats includes a standard definition television format and a high definition television format is met by input switching matrix 68 which provides the YUV data provided by the YcrCb to YUV converter 66, or selects the Y and C component digital signals 74, 76 or combination of the Y and C component digital signals and the YUV signals to the up sampling module 70 (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 7 of Rinaldi et al).

In considering claim 9, the combination of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) and Rinaldi et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the supersampling rate is substantially equal to twice the base sampling rate. The capability

of using the supersampling rate is substantially equal to twice the base sampling rate is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the supersampling rate is substantially equal to twice the base sampling rate into the combination of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) and Rinaldi et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal during sampling process.

In considering claim 10, the combination of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) and Rinaldi et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above, except for providing the claimed wherein the supersampling rate is substantially equal to four times the base sampling rate. The capability of using the supersampling rate is substantially equal to four times the base sampling rate is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known using of the supersampling rate is substantially equal to four times the base sampling rate into the combination of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) and Rinaldi et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal during sampling process.

In considering claim 11, the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed a pixel pipeline circuit configured to provide a pixel stream comprising a first number of digital pixel values per line at a base pixel rate, wherein the pixel pipeline circuit has an input connected with a

digital pixel buffer is met by the pixel pipeline 132 (Fig. 1B), 2) the claimed an encoder coupled to an output of the supersampling circuit and having one or more processor elements configured to convert the supersampled pixel stream to digital sample values for a target analog signal representing the supersampled pixel stream in the target format, thereby generating a supersampled data stream at an enhanced sampling rate is met by the encoder 134 (Fig. 1B), 3), and 3) the claimed a digital to analog converter coupled to an output of the encoder and configured to convert the supersampled data stream to an analog output signal having the target format is met by the DAC 136 (Fig. 1B).

However, the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]) explicitly does not disclose the claimed a supersampling circuit coupled to an output of the pixel pipeline circuit and configured to generate a supersampled pixel stream comprising a second number of digital pixel values per line, the second number being greater than the first number, at a supersampling rate higher than the base sampling rate.

Rinaldi et al teach that the up sampling module 70 which changes the sampling frequency of the signals to match the desired output sampling frequencies (Fig. 2, col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the up sampling as taught by Rinaldi et al into the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006])'s system in order to process the video signals to produce a plurality of different video outputs.

Claims 12-14 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-4, respectively.

Claims 15-16 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 7-8, respectively.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1-2 and further the claimed a pixel generator circuit configured to generate and store, in a pixel buffer, digital pixel data for a frame of an image is met by the pixels input to the pixel pipeline 132 of the admitted prior art (Fig. 1A, 1B, page 2, [0005]-[0006]).

Claims 18-19 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 7-8, respectively.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1 and 2.

Claims 21-22 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 7-8, respectively.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

April 12, 2008

/Trang U. Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622